

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of a certified copy of the priority document submitted December 9, 2003.

Status of the Application

Claims 1-17 are all the claims pending in the Application, as claims 10-17 are hereby added to more fully define the current invention. Claims 1-7 have been rejected.

Claim 1 is also amended to improve its readability, as suggested by the Examiner. This is merely a clarifying amendment, and does not affect the scope of claim 1 in any way, and no estoppel is intended.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 8 and 9 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. However, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner hold in abeyance such rewriting until the Examiner has had an opportunity to reconsider (and withdraw) the prior art rejection of the other claims.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the Drawings as allegedly failing to show the: (1) “curvature in a width direction,” as recited in claim 7; (2) “curvature in a height direction,” as recited in claim 8; and (3) “curvature in both a width and a height direction,” as recited in claim 9. Regarding item (1), Applicants direct the Examiner to FIG. 3A, which shows a curvature in a width direction. Regarding item (2), new FIGS. 3B and 3C are added by this amendment, and

show the curvature in the height direction discussed in the instant specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this objection.

Claim Objection

The Examiner has objected to claim 1, requesting a grammatical correction. Claim 1 is hereby changed according to the Examiner's helpful suggestion. Thus, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Anticipation Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 6 under: (1) 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Monson et al.* (US 6,347,012 B1; hereinafter "*Monson*"); and (2) 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Starkweather* (US 2003/0223113 A1; hereinafter "*Starkweather*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Monson fails to teach or suggest all the claimed features of claim 1

The Examiner takes the position that *Monson* discloses all of the features of claim 1, alleging, *inter alia*, that the curved display screen 15 corresponds to the recited "screen having a predetermined curvature to control a view distance and focus the light rays."

However, Applicants respectfully submit that *Monson* fails to teach or suggest that screen 15 provides any control of "a view distance" or focusing of the "light rays."

Specifically, *Monson* discloses a screen that functions to redirect the light rays 24 from the projectors (51, 52, 53) so that they are emitted parallel to the viewing axis. (col.2, lines 44-53). Thus, the light rays 24 do not converge, and thus cannot reasonably be considered to be "focused" in any fashion. Similarly, such parallel rays cannot provide any control of a view distance.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over the applied reference. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that rejected dependent claim 6 is allowable, *at least* by virtue of its dependency.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Starkweather fails to teach or suggest all the claimed features of claim 1

The Examiner takes the position that *Starkweather* discloses all of the features of independent claim 1, alleging, *inter alia*, that the curved display screen 14 corresponds to the recited “screen having a predetermined curvature to control a view distance and focus the light rays.”

However, Applicants respectfully submit that *Starkweather* fails to teach or suggest that screen 14 provides any control of “a view distance” or focusing of the “light rays.”

Specifically, *Starkweather*’s curved display screen 14 is curved merely to provide both direct and peripheral views of picture to a viewer (each projector 12 provides a different portion of that picture). *Starkweather* fails to teach or suggest any particular focusing of light rays.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over the applied reference. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that rejected dependent claim 6 is allowable, *at least* by virtue of its dependency.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Obviousness Rejection

The Examiner has rejected (1) claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Starkweather* in view of *Hirata et al.* (US 5,200,814; hereinafter “*Hirata*”);

and (2) claims 4, 5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Monson* in view of *Dubin et al.* (US 6,469,830 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that rejected dependent claims 2-5 and 7 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the secondary references applied in this rejection, *Hirata* and *Dubin*, fail to teach or suggest the features missing from the primary reference applied against claim 1 (as discussed above).

Specifically, both *Hirata* and *Dubin* are silent with regard to any focusing of light rays, or controlling of a view distance.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

New Claims

Claims 10-17 are hereby added. Claims 13 and 14 are fully supported by pg. 8, lines 17-20 and pg.9, lines 10-12 of the present Application. Claims 15-17 are fully supported by FIG. 3 of the present Application. Claims 10-12 are respectfully submitted to be allowable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-14 are allowable. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all of the claims 1-14.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Draft Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Appln. No. 10/730,036

Attorney Docket No.: Q77352

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy P. Cremen
Registration No. 50,855

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 14, 2004

Draft Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Appln. No. 10/730,036

Attorney Docket No.: Q77352

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Enclosed please find a new Figures 3A-3C. These Figures replace present Figure 3.

Attachment: New Sheet(s)